

REMARKS

Claim 1 is now pending and stands rejected in the application. Amendments have been made to the specification and claims to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 has been amended to accommodate both this rejection and the outstanding objections, and should now be in condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Greene reference (U.S. Pat. No. 6,434,662). This rejection is respectfully traversed. First, Greene does not teach or suggest "a second calculation section performing a

second calculation which associates the first address with a second address in one-to-one correspondence.” Instead, Greene discloses a hash function 108 that transforms an input **key** into an address **offset** that is then added to a base address.

Further, Greene does not teach or suggest first or second processing sections that send a **first** address to the N storage sections and that selectively send a **second** address to the **same** N storage sections. Instead, Greene only discloses sending a **first** address to a **first** memory and a **second** address to a **second** memory. For at least these reasons, applicant believes that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Applicant believes that the clarifying amendments to claim 1 will make its novelty over Greene more apparent.

CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

Aug 13, 2007

By:


G. Gregory Schwley
Reg. No. 27,382

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/MRN/cg